UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/785,302	02/17/2001	Harold L. Fox	4328 P	2842

7590	06/08/2004

LLOYD W. SADLER OR DANIEL P. McCARTHY
PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER
201 SOUTH MAIN STREET, SUITE 1800
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

EXAMINER
HUTTON JR, WILLIAM D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	6

DATE MAILED: 06/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.		**Applicant(s)**
Office Action Summary	09/785,302		FOX ET AL.
	Examiner		**Art Unit**
	Doug Hutton		2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 February 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *17 February 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

       1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *4*.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the term "format" in Line 2 should be amended to — formatter — because it
appears to be a typographic error.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-4, 9, 11, 13, 14 and 17-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Robertson et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,486,895.

Claim 1:

Robertson discloses a digital computer system for displaying of computer

information in a page-like format (see Figures 1-15; see Column 1, Line 1 through

Column 14, Line 45), comprising:

- a computer processor (see Figure 1; see Column 4, Line 36 through Column 5, Line 36);

- a computer memory electrically connected to said computer processor (see Figure 1; see Column 4, Line 36 through Column 5, Line 36);

- a means for receiving a document into said computer memory (see Figure 2; see Column 5, Line 37 through Column 6, Line 14);

- a document converter for converting said received document into a page view format (see Figure 3; see Column 7, Line 36 through Column 8, Line 48 – the WebBook converts web pages into page objects that are in a "page view format");

- a page turner for animating a page object such that said page object appears to turn in a paper like manner so as to present a new page object (see Figures 10-12; see Column 8, Line 49 through Column 9, Line 58 – the WebBook allows the user to turn the pages); and

- a computer display for displaying said page object and said new page object (see Figures 1 and 10-12; see Column 4, Line 36 through Column 5, Line 36).

Claim 2:

Robertson discloses a digital computer system as recited in Claim 1, further comprising user controls in communication with said processor for controlling said display of said page object (the WebBook provides user controls to control the page objects).

Claim 3:

Robertson discloses a digital computer system as recited in Claim 2, wherein

said user controls are selected from the group consisting of a keyboard input device, a

mouse input device, a touch screen input device, a track ball input device, a soft button

displayable on said computer display, and a sound input device (the WebBook includes

a keyboard, a trackball and a mouse).

Claim 4:

Robertson discloses a digital computer system as recited in Claim 1, wherein

said means for receiving a document is selected from the group consisting of: a

computer network data source, a CD-ROM device, a magnetic media storage device

and an electronic memory storage device (the WebBook receives web pages from the

World Wide Web).

Claim 9:

Robertson discloses a digital computer system as recited in Claim 1, further

comprising a means for maintaining hyperlinks in said received document (the

WebBook includes links to other web pages).

Claims 11, 13 and 14:

These claims merely are for a method of using the digital computer system

recited in Claims 1 and 2. Thus, Robertson discloses every element of these claims

using the same rationale indicated in the above rejections for Claims 1 and 2.

Claim 17:

This claim merely is for a method of using the digital computer system recited in

Claim 1. Thus, Robertson discloses every element of this claim using the same

rationale indicated in the above rejections for Claim 1.

Claim 18:

Robertson discloses a digital computer system, for displaying text, charts and

images in a book-like display format, comprising:

- a computer processor having both random access memory and a mass storage

  device (see Figure 1; see Column 4, Line 36 through Column 5, Line 36);

- a video display card, having a graphic processor, in electronic communication

  with said computer processor (the WebBook *inherently* comprises a video

  display card in that it displays web pages on the computer monitor);

- an operating system, executed on said computer processor, said operating

  system being capable of managing a graphics user interface (the WebBook

  inherently comprises an operating system that manages a graphics user

interface in that it displays web pages on the computer monitor and allows the

user to manipulate the pages);

- a computer program being executed on said computer processor, wherein said

    computer program presents information in a display format which provides for the

    turning of pages of displayed information in a standard book-like format (see

    Figures 10-12; see Column 8, Line 49 through Column 9, Line 58 – the WebBook

    allows the user to turn the pages); and

- a high-resolution computer display device having sufficient display resolution to

    display a two-printed page graphic image in such a manner as headings and

    format are readable to a user, said high-resolution computer display in

    communication with said processor (see Figures 1 and 10-12; see Column 4,

    Line 36 through Column 5, Line 36).

Claim 19:

Robertson discloses digital computer system, for displaying text, charts and

images in a book-like display format, as recited in Claim 18, wherein said computer

program further comprises:

- calculating the spatial information relationships between adjacent and back-to-

    back pages for the display in a standard book or magazine format as the pages

    are turned upon user command (see Figures 10-12 – the WebBook inherently

    calculates spatial information relationship between the pages as they are turned

    in that the content on the pages is visible as the pages are turned).

Claim 20:

Robertson discloses digital computer system, for displaying text, charts and images in a book-like display format, as recited in Claim 18, wherein said computer program operates to preserve the spatial relationship of one or more aspects of a document (the WebBook "preserves spatial relationship of one or more aspects of a document" in that it maintains the "spatial relationship" of the elements that make up each page object).

Claim 21:

Robertson discloses digital computer system, for displaying text, charts and images in a book-like display format, as recited in Claim 18, wherein said computer program further provides the user access to said information spatial relationships, by recording said spatial relationships in a database (the WebBook provides "access to said information spatial relationships, by recording said spatial relationships in a database" in that it allows that user to place a book into a bookshelf and access it at a later time).

Claim 22:

Robertson discloses digital computer system, for displaying text, charts and images in a book-like display format, as recited in Claim 18, wherein said computer program further calculates a three-dimensional representation of said information as

pages are turned and incrementally reveals additional information as said pages are

turned (see Figures 10-12; see Column 4, Line 36 through Column 5, Line 36).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Robertson et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,486,895.

Claim 10:

As indicated in the above discussion, Robertson discloses every limitation of

Claim 1.

Robertson fails to expressly disclose a means for copying information from said

page object to said computer memory. However, at the time the invention was made, it

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to copy information from

a page object to a computer memory. Web pages typically allow the user to copy the

contents of the page to the hard drive of the client computer so that the copied

information can later be used for various purposes, such as pasting the information into

a word processing document or bookmarking a web page.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the digital computer system, disclosed in Robertson, to include a means for copying information from said page object to said computer memory for the purpose of using the copied information for various purposes, such as pasting the information into a word processing document or bookmarking a web page.

Claim 12:

This claim merely is for a method of using the digital computer system recited in Claim 10. Thus, Robertson discloses every element of this claim using the same rationale indicated in the above rejection for Claims 10.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertson et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,486,895, in view of Britton et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,535,896.

Claim 5:

As indicated in the above discussion, Robertson discloses every limitation of Claim 1.

Robertson fails to expressly disclose a document converter that further comprises an HTML to XML formatter.

Britton teaches a document converter that further comprises an HTML to XML

formatter for the purpose of converting web pages that have a mixture of HTML and

XML formats into a single format (see Column 3, Lines 59-62).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify the digital computer system, disclosed in

Robertson, to include a document converter that further comprises an HTML to XML

formatter for the purpose of converting web pages that have a mixture of HTML and

XML formats into a single format, as taught in Britton.

Claims 6-8, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Robertson et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,486,895, in view of Card et al.,

U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0052900 A1.

Claim 6:

As indicated in the above discussion, Robertson discloses every limitation of

Claim 1.

Robertson fails to expressly disclose a page object that further comprises a

wireframe object having a bit-map fixed thereto.

Card teaches a page object that further comprises a wireframe object having a

bit-map fixed thereto (see Paragraph 0064) for the purpose of displaying virtual pages

of a virtual book (see Paragraph 0017).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the digital computer system, disclosed in Robertson, to include a page object that further comprises a wireframe object having a bit-map fixed thereto for the purpose of displaying virtual pages of a virtual book, as taught in Card.

Claim 7:

Robertson fails to expressly disclose a bit-map of a section of said received document.

Card teaches a bit-map that comprises a bit-map of a section of said received document (see Figures 3A, 3B and 10-11) for the purpose of simulating turned pages of an actual book.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the digital computer system, disclosed in Robertson, to include a bit-map of a section of said received document for the purpose of simulating turned pages of an actual book, as taught in Card.

Claim 8:

Robertson fails to expressly disclose a page turner that further comprises a means for presenting a curled page in said computer display.

Card teaches a page turner that comprises a means for presenting a curled page in said computer display (see Figures 3A, 3B and 10-11) for the purpose of simulating turned pages of an actual book.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the digital computer system, disclosed in Robertson, to include a page turner that further comprises a means for presenting a curled page in said computer display for the purpose of simulating turned pages of an actual book, as taught in Card.

Claims 15 and 16:

These claims merely are for a method of using the digital computer system recited in Claims 6 and 7. Thus, Robertson discloses every element of this claim using the same rationale indicated in the above rejections for Claims 6 and 7.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Hencket et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,463,725; Seet et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,496,803; Ho, U.S. Patent No. 6,340,980; Yagita et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,900,876; Killi et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2001/0039552 A1; Hiura et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,628,310; and Damouth, U.S. Patent No. 5,333,255.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Doug Hutton whose telephone number is (703) 305-1701. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (703) 308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

WDH
May 31, 2004

HEATHER HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECH CENTER 2100